

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 15, 16 and 20-22 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found on at least pages 14-15 of Applicants' Specification. Claims 1-22 remain actively pending in the case. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claim is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 2-4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action noted informalities with the Specification. Applicants have amended the Specification as suggested by the Office Action.

In paragraph 6 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16-22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Smart et al. (2003/208691). In paragraph 27 on page 8 of the Office Action, claims 6-7 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smart et al., in view of what was well known in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Smart fails to teach or suggest at least automatically providing the requester with a list of one or more of said plurality of different service providers based on a business criterion as required by Applicants' independent claims. Rather, Smart discloses that when a new device is connected to a local network 100, a multicast announcement is broadcasted to other users on the network. Accordingly, devices currently on the network learn of the new device, and the new device learns of the devices currently on the network. Further, devices on a large network can use a Service Description Directory that represents devices connected to the large network. *See* paragraphs [0053] and [0054]. Thus, a new device, such as a camera 102, can identify the population of devices already connected to the network, and is aware of their attributes and capabilities. *See* paragraph [0081]. The new device will then determine if its own attributes (i.e., criterion) are compatible with the equipment currently attached to the network, such as a printer, and if so, will use the currently attached equipment to perform a task, such as printing a document. *See* paragraph [0081], [0082] and [0115]. Smart may also use other criterion to establish compatibility as disclosed in Table

1 of Smart. See page 8. In sharp contrast, Applicants' invention requires automatically providing a list based on business criterion. See pages 14-15 of Applicants' Specification. Smart does not teach or suggest, expressly or inherently, automatically providing a list based on business criterion.


In order to render a claim anticipated by the prior art, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in a single reference. In construing claims, the court in *Phillips* has recently emphasized that "claims must be read in view of the specification." *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303,1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005). In fact, the Federal Circuit explained that the specification is "usually . . .dispositive. . . [and] the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term." *Id.* (quoting *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582). For these reasons, the Federal Circuit confirmed that it is "entirely appropriate for a court, when conducting claim construction, to rely heavily on the written description for guidance as to the meaning of the claims." *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317.

With respect to claims 14-16 and to the Office Action taking official notice, Applicants respectfully assert that a business criteria formed from business relationships do not constitute facts outside of the record which are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being "well-known" in the art. The references relied on by the Examiner, for example, fail to disclose this purportedly "well known" fact. Applicants contend that reasonable doubt exists regarding the circumstances justifying the Examiner's exercise of official notice, and request that the Examiner provide evidence that demonstrates the appropriateness of the officially noticed facts pursuant to MPEP § 2144.03. Applicants reserve the opportunity to respond to the Examiner's comments concerning any such judicially noticed facts.

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicants' independent claims are patentable over the cited reference. Because claims 2-19 depend from claim 1 and include the features recited in the independent claim, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-19 are also patentably distinct over the cited reference. Nevertheless, Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to such dependent claims and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 53,950

Thomas J. Strouse/phw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-588-2728  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.